

# **The Advisory Committee View**

By the California Water Plan Update 2005 Public Advisory Committee

**Thoughts on the  
California  
Department of  
Water Resource's  
(DWR) Water Plan  
Update Public  
Review Draft**

# THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE VIEW

**June 2005**

**T**his California Water Plan Update 2005, the eighth since 1957, comprehensively reviews the state's water problems and opportunities. Like California, the plan update has changed since 1957. A growing population, increased pressures on our natural environment, concerns about drinking water quality, costs, and many unknowns including climate change are now water planning considerations.

A diverse group of people assisted in developing the plan by serving on an Advisory Committee. The group represented organizations and interests concerned with water resources management. Some of us, including Native Americans and environmental justice groups, had not been represented in past advisory committees. Knowing the plan was DWR's, not ours; we shared suggestions and concerns and posed tough questions. We served as advisors.

As a group, we agreed on many things, but not everything. We expected this. This document explains things we mostly agreed about, describes where we do not agree, and notes the places we still have questions.

We encourage you to read the Public Review Draft thoroughly, participate in the public review process, and offer your comments. This solid planning effort deserves your attention.

## **IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT**

This document offers the many perspectives of the Water Plan Update appointed Public Advisory Committee. It does not represent a policy or view of the DWR, the facilitators or any individual Public Advisory Committee member or member organization. The sole purpose of this document is to share the differing perspectives of the Advisory Committee in order to help the public understand more about the deliberations leading to the Water Plan Update.

## **AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT**

Members of the Advisory Committee generally agreed about **Using a different approach than in the past.** The plan was developed with a large, diverse, and vocal Advisory Committee and tended public involvement. Computer technology helped DWR keep Advisory Committee members and the public up-to-date and informed. Activities and information related to the plan can easily be found at <http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/>.

**Using the document as both a policy guiding strategic plan and a source of technical information.** The Advisory Committee felt a strategic plan, as opposed to a pure technical plan, would help Californians better plan and assess state water management.

**A need for more information than is now available.** We worked with DWR to create a phased work plan. The Plan outlines a schedule to develop improved analytical tools and data. Most desired new work will be completed as part of a 3-phase work plan. The group believes this will help DWR meet Water Code and other legal requirements in the next update. The information will also help local and regional agencies with integrated water resource planning and management. Phased work plan details are found on page 1-5 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan.

*(Continued on page 2 ...)*

## THE PLAN INCLUDES IMPORTANT NEW FEATURES

- More complete and detailed information on actual water flows than were available in previous plans. Called water portfolios, water use categories and water supply information span a full hydrologic cycle (wet, dry and average).
- Except for agricultural trends, use of historic data instead of projections based on current conditions. This information creates an appreciation for California's complex and variable water flows.
- Regional analysis and reports identify unique challenges and specific ongoing programs and plans. Water management is mostly local and regional. Regional reports allow a clearer focus on these problems, within a statewide context.
- Multiple future scenarios (recognizing that uncertainty over the next 30 years makes a single, likely future impossible to present). Numerous events and choices, many unrelated to water planning, may drive the future.
- A focus on integrated regional water management as a key strategy and use of a full range of water management tools. There is no single solution to California's water problems. Local, regional, and statewide integration of multiple solutions will be required.
- The plan outlines methods for data analysis and scenario development to be used in future updates.

## MORE AREAS OF AGREEMENT

*(Continued from page 1)*

**Clear mission and vision statements, five high-level goals, fourteen recommendations, and specific action items for each of the fourteen recommendations.** Other strong points are identification of implementation challenges, as well as performance measures to track progress. This provides a strategic roadmap. It is a call to action.

**Clear statements on essential support activities.** The plan calls on the state to provide leadership, establish credible and reliable financing mechanisms, clarify the authorities and responsibilities of different entities in the water community, invest in water technology, and ensure that equitable decisions are made to provide for fair treatment of low-income people and disadvantaged communities of color in California. One goal is better application of environmental justice criteria and greater inclusion of underserved communities in planning and decision making, with special sensitivity to the unique obligations to Native American communities.

**The presentation of links to CALFED,** that recognize the role the CALFED Bay-Delta Program plays in overall California water issues.

**The importance of water quality to protecting California's waters.**

**The presentation of a good balance between data and policies.**

**Incorporation of information from the state's General Plan Guidelines to promote a better link between water supply planning and local land use planning.**

**The Water Plan contains a responsible chapter on climate change.**

## AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT AMONG ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Sometimes the Advisory Committee did not agree with DWR and/or one another on various aspects of the plan. It has been difficult for DWR to address the sometimes-competing interests of the Advisory Committee members. To some extent this represents different philosophical approaches to dealing with California water problems. The following explains these disagreements in more detail.

- New surface storage, linked to the CalFed program. There were a variety of reasons for this disagreement.
- The group disagrees about the utility, cost-effectiveness, and need for additional surface storage and whether adequate water supply can be provided by the measures described. Some believe there is a need for more storage than the plan recommends while others believe water conservation and efficiency are much better alternatives than expanding infrastructure. The group also disagreed as to how much ecological damage occurs and/or should be tolerated in development of additional water supply.
- Some believe the plan underestimates implementation challenges and suggest more evaluation.

**Disagreements** (continued from page 2)

- There is disagreement about the contribution of agriculture to the overall water efficiency estimates for 2030. Some believe the estimates for water savings for agriculture appear very low. Others believe the agricultural industry has already voluntarily adopted efficiencies shown to improve return on investment, and/or that agriculture is very efficient now within nearly all hydrologic regions due to extensive re-use of agricultural return flows. Some believe numbers for all water use efficiency (not just agricultural) approaches overestimate the potential.
- There are legal requirements for the document. One law requires DWR to make assessments of water needed for the provision of food and fiber to the population. DWR held off in this assessment, waiting for the results of a study to be conducted by another state agency. This study did not occur and DWR provided an interim response to the legislative requirement in the Volume 4: Reference Guide. Some members of the group strongly disagreed with the interim findings and approach.
- Another law requires DWR to provide a gap analysis of predicted water need versus predicted available water. Given the potential for multiple options, the plan instead addressed multiple uncertainties and recommends more complex modeling and other analytical tests than now available. The plan also outlines development of future water use and water supply scenarios. Some find this approach does not meet legal requirements for this document.
- Some believe the plan pushes too hard for market-based solutions to allocating or deciding who gets water when the supply cannot meet all demands. Some believe this could preclude agriculture or the environment from receiving water. Others suggest the plan needs to address long-term socioeconomic issues associated with water transfers. Still others believe changes could compromise historic public legal water rights. Some believe the plan needs to address long-term socioeconomic issues associated with water transfers and not merely ignore these issues.
- Some contend DWR's data as presented in the plan support approaches that are less infrastructure-intensive in nature and feel that the plan is deficient for not including a third *Initiative for Reliability* that directs the state to actively pursue those approaches.
- Others point to DWR data that suggests the major source of "new water" for the state will come through conservation and efficiency measures and that "water efficiency" should be elevated and defined as one of the Initiatives of the Plan. Several others think that the numbers underestimate the potential of water use efficiency approaches. The data and analyses for water use efficiency in the plan are the subject of much debate (as are all the numbers).

**UNCERTAINTIES IN THE PLAN**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Funding at the federal, state and local levels is severely restricted with serious consequences if recommended actions are not funded.  | the term beneficiary. There is a need to outline how the beneficiaries pay principle is to be implemented.  |
| 2. Actions to sustain water supply reliability are directed by local water agencies but the plan does not identify mechanisms to enforce or induce action.   | 5. Some express concern the plan does not address how regions will determine if they will collectively develop enough water both to meet the water needs of their local population and to produce food and other commodities needed by humanity at large. |
| 3. The focus on integrated regional water management is positive but the document does not address state leadership to support and oversee the regional process nor how interregional conflicts will be handled. | 6. There is no specific mechanism to measure whether or not implementation of the plan or individual recommendations was successful.  |
| 4. The update relies in part on the beneficiaries of water being the primary funders of new infrastructure. There is no definition of  | 7. The scenarios will need more development for decision makers to determine viability of the proposed options.   |

### Members of the Public Advisory Committee for the *California Water Plan – Update 2005*

<p><b>Margit Aramburu</b> - Delta Protection Commission  <b>Mary Bannister</b> - Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency  <b>Kirk Brewer</b> - California Water Association  <b>Merita Callaway</b> - California State Assoc. of Counties  <b>Scott Cantrell</b> - California Dept. of Fish and Game  <b>Grace Chan</b> - Metropolitan Water Dist. of Southern CA          Alternate: <b>Don Bentley</b>  <b>Jim Chatigny</b> - Mountain Counties Water Resources Association  <b>Marci Coglianese</b> - League of California Cities          Alternate: <b>Dan Secord, M.D.</b>  <b>Bill Cunningham</b> - Natural Resources Conservation Service          Alternate: <b>Luana Kiger</b>  <b>Grant Davis</b> - Bay Institute of San Francisco  <b>Martha Davis</b> - Inland Empire Utilities Agency  <b>Mary Ann Dickinson</b> - CA Urban Water Conservation Council          Alternate: <b>Katie Shulte-Joung</b>  <b>Nick Di Croce</b> - California Trout  <b>Anisa Divine</b> - Imperial Irrigation District  <b>William DuBois</b> - California Farm Bureau Federation          Alternate: <b>John Hewitt</b>  <b>Howard Franklin</b> - Monterey County Water Resources Agency  <b>Lloyd Fryer</b> - Kern County Water Agency  <b>Bill Gaines</b> - California Waterfowl Association          Alternate: <b>Mark Hennelly</b>  <b>Fran Garland</b> - Contra Costa Water District  <b>Peter Gleick</b> - Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security  <b>Zeke Grader</b> - Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations  <b>Brent Graham</b> - Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District  <b>David Guy</b> - Northern California Water Association          Alternate: <b>Todd Manley</b>  <b>Martha Guzman</b> - United Farm Workers of America  <b>Alex Hildebrand</b> - South Delta Water Agency  <b>Mike Hoover</b> - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  <b>Bill Jacoby</b> - WateReuse Association  <b>Craig Jones</b> - State Water Contractors, Inc.          Alternate: <b>Mary Lou Cotton</b>  <b>Rachel Joseph</b> - Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe          Alternate: <b>Teri Cawelti</b>  <b>Kevin Kauffman</b> - Stockton East Water District          Alternate: <b>Anthony Barkett</b></p>	<p><b>Steve LaMar</b> – CA Building Industry Association          Alternate: <b>Mike Webb</b>  <b>Joseph Lima</b> - Modesto Irrigation District  <b>Jay Lund</b> - University of California, Davis  <b>Steve Macaulay</b> - California Urban Water Agencies  <b>Jennifer Martin</b> - The Nature Conservancy          Alternate: <b>Anthony Saracino</b>  <b>Benjamin Magante, Sr.</b> - San Luis Rey Indian Water Authority  <b>William (B.J.) Miller</b> - Consulting Engineer  <b>John Mills</b> - Regional Council of Rural Counties  <b>Clifford Moriyama</b> – California Business Properties Association  <b>Eric Natti</b> - California Dept. of Parks &amp; Recreation  <b>Valerie Nera</b> - California Chamber of Commerce  <b>James Noyes</b> - Southern CA Water Committee, Inc.          Alternate: <b>Allen Gribnau</b>  <b>Elaine Quitiquit-Palmer</b> – Robinson Rancheria  <b>Enid Perez</b> - Del Rey Community Services  <b>Lloyd Peterson</b> - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation          Alternate: <b>Al Candlish</b>  <b>Cathy Pieroni</b> - City of San Diego Water Department  <b>Nancy Pitigliano</b> - Tulare County Farm Bureau          Alternate: <b>Cheryl Lehn</b>  <b>Betsy Reifsnider</b> - Friends of the River  <b>Terry Roberts</b> - Governor's Office of Planning and Research  <b>Larry Rohlfes</b> - CA Landscape Contractors Association  <b>Spreck Rosekrans</b> - Environmental Defense          Alternate: <b>Ann Hayden</b>  <b>Jennifer Ruffolo</b> - California Research Bureau  <b>Steve Shaffer</b> - California Department of Food and Ag.  <b>Polly Osborne Smith</b> - League of Women Voters of CA  <b>Jim Snow</b> - Westlands Water District  <b>Frances Spivy-Weber</b> - Mono Lake Committee  <b>John Sullivan</b> - League of Women Voters  <b>Walter Swain</b> - U.S. Geological Survey  <b>Greg Thomas</b> - Natural Heritage Institute          Alternate: <b>Rich Walkling</b>  <b>Michael Wade</b> - California Farm Water Coalition  <b>Michael Warburton</b> - The Ecology Center of Berkeley  <b>Arnold Whitridge</b> - Trinity County  <b>Robert Wilkinson</b> - Univ. of California, Santa Barbara  <b>Kourt Williams</b> - Executive Partnership for Environmental Resource Training  <b>Carolyn Yale</b> - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  <b>Gary Yamamoto</b> - California Dept. of Health Services  <b>Tom Zuckerman</b> - Central Delta Water Agency</p>
--	--

